UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Democratic Institutions for the Twentieth Century

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Satan Dances in Geneva

By SYDNEY STRONG

Fear and the Social Tragedy

By STANTON A. COBLENTZ

The Fascist Raj

VOLUME CX NUMBER 13

Chicago, December 12, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 195
Democratic Institutions for the Twentieth Century—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 197
Jottings.—J. H. H. 199

ARTICLES—
War and the Future!—*Romain Rolland* 195
Satan Dances in Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG 199
Fear and the Social Tragedy—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 201
The Fascist Raj—E. H. 202

POETRY—
Trinkets—LEGARDE S. DOUGHTY 203

THE STUDY TABLE—
Philosophy and Some Practical Problems—MAYNARD SHIPLEY. 204
Gas Warfare—J. H. H. 205
What's Going on in Washington—R. C. SCHALLER 206

CORRESPONDENCE—
Socialism Before and After the Election—EDWIN D. MEAD. ... 206
Breakers Ahead!—F. S. KINDER 207
Fit to Survive—HERBERT N. ROTEFSKY 207

THE FIELD—
Rome and the United States—*Henry H. Klein* 194

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Rome and the United States

The United States is following the course of Rome. Rome began as a small community and in time became a large city and controlled most of the known world before the beginning of the Christian Era. It reached its climax as a republic at the time of Caesar. The population of the City was about one million, though it dominated the affairs of one hundred million people through conquest. The wealth of the Roman world was centered in the City of Rome.

At the time of Caesar, the Roman world was ruled by its chief monopolists who constituted the Roman Senate. They exploited the people through high prices and possessed enormous fortunes.

Caesar was an army general, popular with the people and a man of great intelligence and ambition. He challenged the right of the monopolists to continue to rule. This challenge culminated in Caesar's assassination in the Senate Chamber, on a day in March about fifty years before the Christian Era. History records that the Senators conspired to end Caesar's existence before he could overthrow them.

Caesar's assassination ended control of the Roman world by the money powers. Their monopolies were broken and the government was changed from a republic to an empire. Caesar's nephew, Octavius, became the first imperial ruler. His rulership lasted about thirty years, after which time the power of Rome began to dwindle. For several centuries thereafter there was only a semblance of law and order in the empire until it was overrun by so-called barbarians who took control of government which had been peddled to the highest bidder for several generations. Graft, plunder and corruption were rampant in the republic and in the empire.

The growth of the United States as a republic is almost parallel with that of Rome. The United States developed from a barren country at the time of Columbus until it has become the richest nation on earth. The wealth of the people, 120,000,000 of them, is estimated at three hundred billion dollars and is greater than the wealth of the next half dozen leading nations. This wealth is concentrated in the hands of those who control private monopoly just as it was concentrated in the hands of those who controlled private monopoly in Rome.

The chief monopolists in the United States control the government and exploit the people. Our monopolists do not wear the senatorial togas, but their representatives in government do their bidding and have done it for the past fifty years. It is worth hundreds of millions of dollars annually

(*Continued on page* 208)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1932 Number 13

WAR AND THE FUTURE!

"No way exists of escaping war. I believe human insanity irremediable.

"But this in no way exempts the handful of rational men from standing firm—if not for safety, at least for self-respect—and because one is not at liberty to deny one's duty when one sees it. The heroic refusal of Gandhi is the response I espouse. I prophesy to it the destiny of a second Christianity (the first was in its origins an international accord of Peace among men and a denial of imperial violence).

"I believe, moreover, that I can assure those who fear the end of the human race. The life of the beast is bound to its body. It has already been wasted a hundred times. It will survive this pestilence as it has survived others, but it will be subdued and once more driven back many centuries. This is the manner of progress. Its tenacity to live again counterbalances its frenzy to die."

—*Romain Rolland*, in *Avant-Propos* to "Gaz."

The strain of the present crisis on our democratic institutions is terrific. The War imposed the first great stress. Temporarily every democracy went out of business during that period of military conscription, suspension of civil liberties, seizure of properties, and so on. After the War came the long agony of the peace, with one democracy after another going definitely to the wall. Years ago democracy disappeared in Italy, Hungary, and most of the Danubian countries. Last summer began that long series of governmental decrees in Germany which have eliminated the Weimar Constitution and established in that country a dictatorship in all but name. In England, in the fall of 1931, J. Ramsay MacDonald suddenly seized the government, got rid of his Labor Party, and by a super-legal course of action almost unprecedented in history passed over power to old-time Toryism. In Japan the military has completely superseded the civil rulers, and established what looks at this distance to be pure Fascism. And America, in its attempts to meet the crisis of the depression, seems to be groaning in every cog and piston of its political machinery. On the other side, to hold the balances even, we see only Mexico and Spain now vindicating the principles of democratic policy; and, with both of these countries, of course, democracy is a new broom which for the moment is sweeping clean. What we have here, of course, in the collapse of democracy, is only one more casualty of the Great War. In this instance, as in the far earlier instance of the Peloponnesian War in classic Greece, the free society could not stand the strain of armed conflict. Nor when the War was done, was there any opportunity for liberty to reassert and reestablish itself. Whether democracy will survive this epoch is perhaps all wrapped up in the question as to whether our civilization itself will ultimately survive. And then there is the further question as to whether this civilization is worth saving at all, if democracy is destroyed.

Everywhere campaigns for relief are being vigorously conducted. It reminds us of the drives during the Great War—drives then to kill men, drives now to keep man alive! We thought such orgies of appeal were demoralizing in 1917-18, and we think so still, except that in these campaigns for funds to feed the starving we feel it our duty to do our "bit," whereas in the earlier campaigns for funds to buy munitions to slay soldiers, we felt it our duty *not* to do our "bit." But psychologically we have a common phenomenon here, and in both of its manifestations it is a scandal. That we have to resort to such methods to take care of our millions of unemployed is just one more evidence of the degeneracy of our present-day society. In the first place, of course, there should be no unemployed and by the same token no hungry men, women and children. But taking this as an inevitable part of our individualistic economy, we insist that these helpless and blameless multitudes should be taken care of adequately and with dignity as a part of the public burden of social maintenance. We say "adequately," because, under the present system of charitable relief, funds are so scarce and so hard to get, that they are necessarily distributed in the most niggardly fashion, and with gross inequalities. We say also "with dignity," for we know of nothing more shameful than the necessity forced upon the starving of going to established agencies as beggars, to prove their need for aid. Furthermore—to jump to another aspect of the problem!—how many of the rich and well-to-do actually contribute to these campaigns; and of those who give, how many give with genuine generosity? The funds, as a matter of fact, come from a pitifully small proportion of those who have wealth, plus many thousands of underpaid employees of big corporations and business offices generally, from whom money is extorted under tacit threat of penalties. What we should have in this country is that scientific system of

national unemployment insurance which we try to stigmatize under the name of the "dole." Under this system the burden of social misery is carried by society itself. An effective distribution of wealth is achieved by governmental authority as a kind of anticipation of the real distribution some day destined to be achieved. And incidentally the hungry are fed with dignity, justice, and goodwill.

Are any elections in this country honest? Paul Blanshard, Executive Director of the City Affairs Committee in New York, declares that the metropolis has never had an honest election. Certainly this last election was not honest. Its scandals were flagrant and unconcealed. A popular movement to "write in" the name of Mr. McKee as an independent nominee for mayor was so successfully blocked by Democratic and Republican election officials, who resorted in conspiracy to all manner of illegal devices, that a vote conservatively estimated at 400,000 was cut down to 137,000. Socialist votes, counted out for years in all Tammany districts, were this year counted out more extensively than ever. The presence in the town of hundreds of thousands of down-and-outs, "bums," and the desperate unemployed generally, offered a marvelous opportunity to purchase votes, and the opportunity was not lost. If any innocent observer is marveling at Roosevelt's huge majority in New York City, let him remember the thousands of homeless men who had the money for a good bed and a square meal on election night. What happened in New York undoubtedly happened elsewhere. In Newark, for example, a recount was ordered in a certain district. In the dead of night, a gang of politicians stole the ballot-boxes, supposedly guarded by policemen, and burned the ballots in a nearby vacant lot. Socialists and Communists are everywhere easy victims by the joint agreement of Republican and Democratic election inspectors. Nothing is more common than the personal reports of Socialist voters in districts in all states which make an official return of "no Socialist votes cast." Honest elections? —there are none in this country. Our politics are as rotten as our business. A third party, Socialist or otherwise, faces no more formidable problem than that of actually getting its votes counted and recorded.

The *New Leader,* organ of the Socialist Party, is praising the American Federation of Labor for its recent action in support of unemployment insurance. This is magnanimous, but is it intelligent? Why should the A. F. of L. be lauded for learning a purely elementary lesson from such a dire disaster as this current economic prostration? Do we praise a steamship company for equipping its vessels with adequate lifeboats after one of their ships has gone down with a loss of hundreds of helpless lives? Do we praise factories for providing adequate fire-escapes after a conflagration has roasted hundreds of employees to death, as in the famous "Triangle" horror? Do we praise a householder for putting insurance on his property after his home has burned to the ground as a total loss? The American Federation of Labor has come out for unemployment insurance decades after its successful establishment in European countries and its endorsement by all competent authorities, and years after the depression has cast millions of honest and willing workers into the breadline. *Now,* when starvation is knocking at our doors, this blind, stupid, class-bound organization of labor actually confesses that it thinks there ought to be some protection for workers under our existing system of economic insecurity! Had the Federation come to this conclusion a generation ago, and joined the Socialists and others who have been advocating this simple and scientific precaution through all this time, we might have had a social insurance scheme long since established, and labor therefore amply protected against the distresses of these days. But, no!—the Federation, as always, opposed a plan as wise as it was progressive, and carries today its heavy share of responsibility for what is going on. There is some truth in the old adage—"better late than never." But there is also truth in that most damning of all indictments—"too late! *too late!!*"

The key to the debt riddle is disarmament. Keep to that fact, and not only will Europe be released but the world itself be saved. We deplore that French and English statesmen did not see this fact. Instead of asking flatly and unimaginatively for a moratorium, and thus creating the suspicion of repudiation· why did they not declare that they wanted a postponement of payment because they wanted time to see if they could not accomplish a disarmament at Geneva which would lift and lighten the whole burden of indebtedness? This would itself have disarmed all this opposition in Congress and elsewhere which is now threatening to be so serious an obstacle to settlement. President Hoover, to his honor be it said, seems to be the one statesman in the world who sees this connection. We hope that Franklin Roosevelt has learned it at his knee in the White House conference. Surely the American reply to the European nations must stress this fact, and if it does, we shall believe for the first time in the possible success of the Disarmament Conference. The more we think of it the more we feel that fate is playing with us in this impassé, with the dice loaded this time in favor and not against humanity. But fate must divide responsibility with men, and men may muddle even the most wonderful chance of destiny. It is a fearful thing to realize that what Hoover, Herriott, and MacDonald do, or do not do, in the next few months, may determine finally what is to befall this generation and perhaps unnumbered generations to come. And America holds the whip-hand! Herbert

Hoover has three months still in office. In this brief period of time he may accomplish deeds which will give his name such lustre as will make ridiculous the overwhelming defeat which he suffered at the hands of the electorate.

Some days ago a criminal confined in a jail in New York was visited by his wife on the eve of his transfer to Sing Sing to serve a long sentence for a bank robbery. The woman, by a clever ruse, smuggled a loaded revolver into her husband's hands. Immediately he started to shoot his way out of the prison. He was met by pistols as deadly as his own. A desperate affray ensued. When the firing was over, the head-keeper was dead, the warden was wounded, and the desperado was himself slain by his own hand. A nice little affair of violence, quite in accordance with the established mode of the times! The whole thing reminded us of the way nations conduct their business with one another in these enlightened days. War is the method used for settling all international difficulties. And what is war? It is a nation proceeding to shoot its way out of a dilemma from which it sees no other means of escape. And armaments? They are the guns that these desperado nations keep on hand for a fight of this kind whenever necessary. And how do these fights come out? Usually much like this furious duel in the New York jail—with the nation in question successful in killing or terribly wounding its enemy, and equally successful in killing itself. Nothing could seem to be madder than this prison affray, with its murder and suicide. Yet war is madder, for this is murder and suicide not of a few men, but of millions. What lunatics we are! When are we going to recover our sanity, and at least make it impossible for these criminal nations to get the guns with which they madly shoot their way out of their difficulties? Disarmament, friends! This is not the whole problem by any manner of means, but it is a good place to begin.

Democratic Institutions for the Twentieth Century

Democracy as an interpretation of the method of the creative process is to be distinguished from democracy as a political method. It is one thing to say that democracy is a spiritual process; that it is a tendency inherent in the very nature of things for this process to seek for every individual the largest possible opportunity for the development of his powers. It is another thing to say that our present forms of political democracy assist in the attaining of this end.

Political democracy is being challenged on every hand. Its efficiency is denied. Mussolini declared that political democracy is an utter failure. Lenine affirms that it is bankrupt. Certainly in the present crisis the parliamentary form of government has failed to meet the challenges presented to it. In every parliamentary and legislative hall in the world we have had, during the past two years, debates that have hardly been up to the high school standard. Instead of a group of men representing a country gathering together to consider ways and means we have witnessed the struggles for advantage on the part of party leaders.

If unity of spirit as well as an intelligent understanding of the tragic situation presented to the Western World is desired, certainly political campaigns and parliamentary bodies have not aided in attaining this end. Unity, oneness of purpose, cannot be forced upon any people for any length of time. Such unity must grow out of the recognition of a common need and earnest desire on the part of all to meet the need. Our partisan strifes and political campaigns, instead of helping us attain such a unity of spirit, have driven us farther and farther apart.

If the end we seek through democracy is the largest possible life for all, surely it can only come about through the establishment of such political institutions as will contribute to this end. This inevitably will mean that we shall have to change our whole ideal and method of political democracy. Today in America for the most part our elections have neither to do with principles nor with reason. They are for the most part explosions of emotion on a very low level. The encouragement given to the political speaker by those in his audience who cry, "Hit 'em again!" or "Give 'em Hell!" may add to the gaiety of the occasion but it is no contribution to sober judgment or understanding of social problems. Today we have our slogans, shibboleths and party emblems. They are decorative but not at all illuminating. Our theory is that one man is as good as another. Therefore one man's opinion must be as good as another's. Our legislatures are filled with men who reflect this sort of thing and out of them come a hodgepodge of laws most of which have very little relation, if any, to public weal.

The first change that ought to be made is to get rid of the very large number of elective offices. The blanket ballot is worse than a crime, it is a bad joke. The election of men to fill clerical, minor administrative and technical offices is absurd. It is no violation of the fundamental democratic principles to place responsibility for the election of men for these minor offices on one man. The present method of election of most of our offices is on a purely personal basis which results in bickering and strife, whose only results are to create feelings of bitterness, hatred, and envy. The filling of these offices by appointment would remove a very large amount of friction.

The second change should be the substitution of single for double chambered legislatures. The latter

afford most excellent opportunities for "passing the buck." They are an inheritance from feudalism. They represent the "lag" in our political thought of more than a thousand years. It is absurd to build political institutions for the twentieth century on thirteenth century models. This again is no violation of the fundamental principles of democracy. It is only a recognition of the fact that we can only get the results of responsibility by placing responsibility.

The third change would require an entire overthrow of our present methods of legislation. At the present time the members of the legislature are selected without the slightest regard to their fitness as lawmakers. They are called upon to pass laws dealing with the most highly complicated and difficult questions in finance and industry. They neither have special knowledge nor even general information. A candidate for congress recently informed us that he knew nothing about the tariff but that he expected to get information when he reached Washington. When asked about his position in reference to Mussel Shoals he revealed the fact that he did not know whether it was a new form of soup or a danger to navigation. It is men such as these that are permitted to prepare and to enact laws vitally affecting our whole civilization. It is no wonder that the legislative bodies have greatly come into contempt and that the prayer of the electorate is that the session may speedily end. Even if the members of the legislature are men of more than usual knowledge they are not fitted to pass upon highly technical and complicated questions in the field of finance and industry. Laws dealing with various aspects of these subjects should be prepared and presented to the legislative body by people who have special knowledge.

Some years ago the legislature of this state appointed a commission to prepare a workman's compensation bill. The five members of the commission spent two years in special study of the subject. A library was gathered dealing with the subject. At the end of two years a Workmen's Compensation Bill was presented to the legislature. Compensation is a highly technical subject. There was not a single member of either house of the legislature who had the slightest knowledge of the principles involved or the technical matters included in the bill. The legislature was in a measure qualified to pass upon a matter of general policy,—the question as to whether or not a compensation bill should be passed. But by the farthest stretch of the imagination no one could conceive of the members of the legislature having the knowledge required for the preparation of such a bill. And it is just as true that no member of the legislature was qualified to offer any amendment. The only rational and reasonable way to amend the bill was to ask the commission to do so.

In the field of what is known as social legislation it is only by rare accident that any member of a legislature is qualified to act. Social workers who have specific knowledge of social needs are qualified to prepare legislation in this field. Two years ago a voluntary committee was organized to present to a legislature a bill that would vitally affect the social life of the state. Its value was recognized by the members of the legislature as soon as it was brought to their attention. The fact is that no one in the legislature would have thought of presenting such a bill, but on the presentation of the case by competent authorities they willingly agreed to the policy and the specific features of the bill. However, as the bill was going through the Senate one senator had a bright idea and without consulting the members of the committee proposed an amendment. He was popular, he had a good talking point, and without the intention of wrecking the bill he, by carrying through this amendment, did so.

The fact is, that under our present system it is only upon rare occasions that the possessor of expert knowledge in any field is called upon for advice in passing legislation concerning the most serious problems presented to society. We have in almost every university serious students of criminology. These are supported at public expense. Yet your legislatures continually enact laws in complete ignorance of the social effect these laws may have.

What is here suggested is that our legislative bodies should have for their principal duty the establishment of public policies. They are not qualified and never will be to pass on the technical details of legislation. When they attempt to there results the contentions, the indecisions, the inefficiency which characterize all our legislative bodies.

We do not propose a bureaucratic system. We do propose, however, that all legislation be prepared by persons that are qualified to do so. Commissions for this purpose might be authorized by the governor, the legislature, or they might be the result of voluntary action and receive, later, official approval by the legislature.

In America, the trouble with this proposition lies in the fact that in spite of the millions we spend for education we hold the people who know in the utmost contempt. We honor the expert only if he is "our expert." The action of Hoover in reference to considering the advice of 1,023 professors of political economy in regard to the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Bill is typical of our general attitude toward those who have special knowledge. Anyone interested in social legislation is painfully aware of the almost unfathomable depth of ignorance which prevails. This is revealed in the frequently expressed opinion that "I know as much about social work as any one." The carrying of a basket of provisions to a destitute family is generally considered as equivalent to a diploma from a school of social work. So we proceed in all these

important matters ignoring and neglecting a vast amount of knowledge which lies at hand. Our legislative bodies contain within them many men of ability and occasionally a man of extensive knowledge; but we place upon the membership as a whole a task for which they are utterly unfitted and give them tools which might have been useful some centuries ago but which today are utterly unfit to meet the need. In political matters we are on the level of the man who tries to carry on a modern farm with hoe, spade, and rake.

The end of all democracy is a richer and fuller life for individuals. Those political tools which lead only to partisan strife bring us no nearer to this goal. With all our campaigning we only succeed in securing the victory of one political faction over another. We have most excellent machinery for the creation of division based on non-important and non-essential matters. It is to be hoped that if we could develop a respect for leadership based on knowledge our legislation might not be so spectacular or erratic. Instead of our laws being the result of revivalistic emotionalism they might at least be an aid to steady and orderly progress.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Jottings

It is refreshing to read that Lord Passfield has tired of his title, and will be known again as simple "Sidney Webb." But what a pity that some of Lord Passfield's acts, as well as his name, cannot be wiped out. The Palestine report, for example!

We deplore the persistent misspelling of Gandhi's name—"Ghandi" instead of "Gandhi"! All the more as "Ghandi" is an opprobious word in the Indian language.

UNITY recently reviewed a new book entitled "Liberalism in the South." We have to confess that the title of this volume reminded us of a certain very famous book on the snakes in Ireland.

"Drop in railroads' income now almost halted."—New York *Times.*

Falling from the roof of a twenty-story building, a man struck the sidewalk. His "drop" was "almost halted."

Norman E. Mack says that he expects the Democrats to rule the nation as well as they have New York. Yeah! that's just about what we have been expecting ourself.

Ironies of Circumstance: (10)—that when people are free, they are disorderly; and when they are orderly, they are not free.

J. H. H.

Satan Dances in Geneva*

[From Our Special Correspondent]

When I review the past week, I am tempted to think that Satan and Mars combined to frame up a diabolical program for this particular city—the "City of Peace"—during Armistice Week, with its meetings, exhibitions, "Silence"—the week before the Council (Lytton Report), the Disarmament Bureau, that promised to open a new chapter. Certainly, the devils have been dancing with extra glee—from the Rond Point, past the Cathedral and the Hotel de Ville, along rue Calvin, over Pont au Mont Blanc, along Quai President Wilson and out to the League of Nations—as they beheld the irreparable disaster that has come down upon the city.

As I look back over the week and walk around among the bewildered people, I feel like beating upon my breast, after the manner of those who had seen the crucifixion of the Prince of Peace, and were returning home to their dull tasks.

Satan stole up on Geneva's weak side. Geneva is Puritan. (I have a right to speak, for I am Puritan from my youth up, and for generations.) The Puritan believes in law and order. His strong side! The Puritan also believes in the gun. *His weak* side! As a child, I often saw pictures in Sunday School books of the New England Puritan going to church. He carried the Bible in one hand, and the gun in the other. I recall Roger Williams—the one distinguished American in Geneva's Reformation Monument—that he was driven out of Puritan Boston because he held some social theories which did not agree with those of the elders in Boston. He founded Rhode Island, noted for its tolerance. The Puritans of New England treated the Quakers similarly, men who did not believe in the gun. The Puritan is a grand figure in history but he has a weak side—his appeal to force. Here he can learn from the Quakers, from Gandhi. This Geneva tragedy has revealed a truth that I have held, as a Christian for years, that guns should be taken away from mankind—that cities and nations without guns would be safer and better. I have been saying about the Disarmament Conference, that it was folly for nations to try to disarm without first discarding their arms. It will be a backward step for Germany to return to conscription and guns.

I am not raising the question of blame for the Geneva tragedy. It is wiser in such disasters for each one to question himself. This tragedy has confirmed my conviction that appeal to arms is a mistake, and only scatters the doctrines it was meant to destroy.

Geneva's Passion Week. I prophesy that this

*The details of the tragedy cited by Dr. Strong will be remembered by our readers. A crowd of workers was fired upon by soldiers, and many killed and wounded.—Editor.

week will be remembered for the next half century. Not that I would have it so—the reverse—but I have observed similar tragedies in America. Geneva is divided. A gulf has been widened. This division partly accounts for the tragedy. And now the division has been baptized in blood, and some of it innocent blood. This stiffens the will of the rulers. It also glorifies a company of "martyrs for a cause." It will be difficult to forget. Armistice Day will be grimly celebrated in Geneva in years to come.

I wish that the whole week could be blotted out, and the citizenry have a fresh start. Last Sunday, at church, it was my prayer during the whole hour of the service, that in some way the deep wound might be healed. I was thinking of the unprecedented number of funerals that made Saturday a day of mourning. The fact of a dozen deaths was not the most serious side of it. It was the sad effect on the people of Geneva, the political and spiritual chasm that had been made, reaching clear down into schools and colleges and shops and offices, spreading distrust and fear. It was also the sad effect on the world, that had been looking to Geneva as a Peace City. This very Sunday several thousand soldiers were patroling its streets! It constituted a comment of irony on the idea of disarmament.

And I heard the wise words of the preacher, spoken with tenderness for the city he loved: We have all been shocked. We must be slow to condemn. In times of conflict we all share the guilt. We need to bow our heads in shame and penitence and lift them up to accept a new responsibility. We need to understand others less fortunate perhaps than ourselves, to possess greater forgiveness. The pastor called upon his people to seek earnestly to try to discover and blend with Christianity those features in Socialism and Fascism that were good. Careers are open everywhere to young Christians who in the spirit of love and understanding will bring peace and harmony where conflict existed.

While the pastor was speaking, I was reminded of a great saying of the Master, "Think ye, that these men were sinners above others? . . . I tell you, except you repent, you shall likewise perish."

A great tragedy has been committed. We are all to blame. O, that there might be a great forgiveness—a blanket of forgetfulness spread over this beautiful city. O, that leaders in reconciliation might come together—from various parties—realizing that they are brothers living under one roof. *They must love, and not hate!*

At that moment someone sang (surely, it was God, or there is no God) a solo, "God so loved the world!" He repeated it again and again, so that it might sink into our hard hearts, *"God* so loved the world"—"God so *loved* the world"—"God so loved the *world"*—and, then to press the great truth home, the congregation was asked to join in Zundel's hymn:

There's a wideness in God's mercy, like the wideness of the sea;
There is kindness in his justice, which is more than liberty.
For the love of God is broader than the measures of man's mind,
And the heart of the Eternal is infinitely kind.

If only that song could ring out over the hills from the Hotel de Ville to the fartherest home, in sincerity, it might heal the wound that otherwise will be a festering sore. Satan has certainly been dancing up and down the streets of the city, while Mars was standing in the shadow keeping watch over his own. Nothing can heal the wound but forgiveness, justice and love.

I would appeal to the citizens of Geneva. I am one of you. The ideas of Calvin helped to shape the institutions and training of my ancestors for generations. I have a birthright to speak. This sudden tragedy has pushed you out upon the stage, where the vast audience of mankind is watching. The world is puzzled and startled. What has occurred this last week if allowed to stand, or, worse, to be aggravated by trials, propaganda and gossip, will constitute a living exhibit which will defeat endeavors for peace that the nations are painfully making. If this sore, this Satanic tragedy, is not healed in the city of Peace—people will say, what is the use of trying for peace between nations, so diverse in ideas, tongues and inheritance.

Solemnly I say, the city of Geneva has been put on trial.

Won't this beautiful city show the world how wounds can be healed—1st, by forgiveness; 2nd, by showing that neither truth nor error can be destroyed by force; 3rd, by proving that order can be maintained among citizens, without guns, even as in London, or as the rod has gone from the home and school. The forces making for reconciliation are surely sufficient to bring restoration.

The nations are trying to disarm. Civilization depends upon their success. They are finding it very difficult. A successful exhibit of how it can be done, here at the center, in Geneva and Switzerland, would greatly hearten the peoples. It is worth a tremendous effort. This tragedy has created a responsibility that cannot be avoided. It has created an opportunity also for Geneva to become a celestial city, in which dwell righteousness, peace and healing.

I have been for several weeks observing the work of the Bureau, appointed by the Conference, to do interim work, largely in view of the absence of Germany. This Bureau consists of 50 men, from as many nations, under the chairmanship of Mr. Henderson going over what ground it could, with Germany out. They have been discussing the use of chemicals, private manufacture of arms, composition of a permanent disarmament commission, supervision and the like. There was agreement that they were putting the cart before the horse, in taking up such things previous to determination of the kind of disarmament that would be determined upon. This Bureau agreed upon two things: 1. The Permanent Disarmament Commission should be made up of one member from each nation. 2. It should function in connection with the Secretariat of the League. All this before there is a decision to disarm. This means that two or three of the nations that dominate the League will need nothing more in order to dominate the arming of the world. The amount of disarming that took place would not make much difference to these nations, if the two things mentioned were nailed down. This putting the cart before the horse may be a clever move, in case you have a wise horse, who is in the push.

I have been deeply interested in testing out the idea of the law of peace. There is one, I am certain. Zone Gale in a recent editorial in UNITY calls attention to what she calls a law of nature. Her principal contention is to find that law in the moral and ethical realm, and you have a basis for your code. This was

what Henry George was after in his Single Tax, and Newton was after in the law of gravitation. The discovery of the law is the beginning of understanding. So, I have been seeking for the law of peace. I have observed these fifty men try to come to an agreement on the use of gas, bombing planes, of tanks, of submarines, etc. At only one point could they agree —however pleasant they were in speech to each other. They could agree, in principle, when it was abolition, or prohibition. The *law* for peace and disarmament demands total disarmament. Disarmament *cannot* be effected short of abolition, because of a discernible irreconcilability that appears when any arms are retained in the effort to come to an agreement. . . . My observations this past month in this Bureau have confirmed me in the belief that peace *cannot* be obtained short of total disarmament now.

A few words about the Lytton Report which comes before the Council of the League next week. The gossip is that both Japan and China are playing for time. Maybe. At any rate, it is thought that the proceedings will last until Christmas. It will be an interesting drama, with an interesting chairman of the Council, namely De Valera, who apparently has some kind of star looking after his journey through earth. If I had the ears of Japan and China, I would shout in them: You are two gumps to allow other nations to come in and settle your quarrels. Brace up. Advance and shake hands. Politely bow the busybody neighbors out the front door. Sit down and play a game of checkers. Then come to an agreement *by yourselves*. You could do no worse than read how Abraham and Lot settled a land question without strife when there was not land enough for both. Abraham was a wise man, and allowed Lot his choice. The last we hear of Lot, he was fleeing Sodom, and was so drunk that his daughters had to cover up his bestiality.

I have read many books giving the "side" of China and Japan. I have also read the "Report." Japan's books would make good stories on pirates, chaos, Communism (getting well advertised) and boycotting. If I were Japan, I'd cut out these matters, and approach China in the most gracious manner, and tell what a good fellow he is—and, to let bygones be bygones. Ditto, same advice to China. Let me tell you both. Your western troubles come chiefly from the outside. Read over together the "Lytton Report." Have a good laugh. Notice the places where outsiders are trying to get their hands into your affairs. If you let them in, even as advisers only, let me tell you, it will be a *cold day before they get out*. Beware. Be wise. Beware. *Settle your own affairs. If you do, your neighbors will respect you all the more.*

SYDNEY STRONG.

C/o American Express,
Geneva, Switzerland.

Fear and the Social Tragedy

Amid the blasts and counter-blasts of the depression; amid the confused cries for relief and the blundering efforts to stanch bleeding wounds; amid the appeals for financial readjustment, for new programs of taxation and for unemployment remedies, there is one fact that has been often overlooked perhaps for the very reason that it is too obvious to attract attention. And that is a fact rooted not so much in economic as in psychological realities; a fact that automatically creates a vicious, almost a poisonous state of mind in the great mass of men in capitalistic countries; a fact that emphasizes the separateness of individuals, that forestalls most efforts at effective social action, and that sharpens the edge of economic need until it torments and slays with quite unnecessary ferocity.

In a word, the present economic system is admirably calculated to create a psychology of fear, and through fear to arouse that callousness, madness and cruelty so abundantly manifest in human relationships today. Had the existing regime come into being through the deliberate plotting of a demon rather than through chance and cupidity, and had that demon racked his brains to discover what force in human nature could be developed to most malign advantage, probably he would have decided that nothing could better suit his purpose than the elemental emotion of fear. Here is a power strong as human nature itself, and blind as the primeval jungle; here is an agency proof against the reasonings of the wise and the compunctions of the scrupulous. And so the demon, with a sort of enlightened malevolence, might have resolved to spread fear throughout human life—a fear which, by an irony, would have shown no connection with any natural need. "What is the usual source of fear?" he would have asked himself. And the answer would have been inescapable, "Insecurity or danger, either real or imagined." And so his task would have been to put danger or insecurity, either real or imagined, into the daily lives of men. And this he could not have accomplished more thoroughly than by devising the present economic order.

For what, in effect, does the economic order say to every man? Might not its implied message cause our hypothetical demon many a secret chuckle? "Beware! else you will be headed straight for disaster! Beware! else you will fall beneath that greatest of perils, indigence! Beware! lest you starve, and your family starve with you! or forfeit pride and prestige by accepting alms!"

To the vast majority of men under capitalistic rule, this danger is perpetual, this dread ever-recurrent —and what is the inevitable result? In order to answer this question, we need only ask what is the way of safety provided by capitalistic precepts. We need only consider that none are even relatively secure unless they be capitalists on a considerable scale; that the road to deliverance is the road of accumulation, and that accumulation is aimed invariably for the good of the individual regardless of its social implications. Hence we find ourselves pursuing a vicious circle: insecurity, by producing fear, stimulates the desire for material possessions, which in turn develops all the selfishness and greed inherent within man's nature and stifles the forces of social helpfulness and cooperation. That man who, all his days, is haunted by the phantom of potential personal need, will not be the man to prove considerate of a rival in business; to lose profits in order to assist the needy; to forfeit financial advantage because of a resultant social gain. It will not matter that the phantom of need never becomes more than

a phantom; it will not even matter that the individual may in time reach a position of supreme financial safety; his earlier training, his earlier fears will still dominate, and reason will be powerless to free him from that psychology of accumulation which has become a habit and almost an instinct to him. Consequently, we find that many rich men who began as poor boys do not lose their avidity for new possessions, even though their gains be little more than symbols scrawled on paper.

And, consequently, we may observe the entire social mechanism oriented in a self-destructive direction. While actually our industrial apparatus is sufficient to provide for the needs of all, the fact is cryingly obvious that the needs of multitudes are not provided for; but where reason would attempt a solution by remedying the evils in distribution, fear enters like a thief in the night to enhance those very evils; and as the errors in the apportionment of wealth grow more acute, the dread aroused by the observed consequences stimulates the piling of fault upon fault, and those not already secure become all the more frantic to increase the inequalities of life by obtaining such a disproportionate share of the world's wealth as may shield them permanently from want.

The irony, the tragedy, the social wastefulness of all this centers about the fact that the majority of all accumulations are never required for personal use by the accumulator. These bank deposits, these stocks and bonds, these bits of real estate, these securities of any kind, acquired at the cost of lifelong toil, of finer instincts submerged, of human obligations flouted, of laborers exploited and overworked, may in the end serve no valuable purpose even to the individual; they may be as needless to their possessor as they have been inimical to society; they may prove to be nothing more than sacrifices offered at the altar of fear—sacrifices more costly, and in a sense more barbarous, than ever a savage devotee hurled into the flames of a thunder-wielding divinity.

It does not follow, of course, that were the motive of fear eliminated, the anti-social forces behind modern acquisitivenss would be totally checked. The urgency of precedent and example, the greed for power, and the sheer might of inertia would still have to be overcome; yet it is safe to assume that, were modern man relieved from that insecurity and that consequent dread which drives him into the race for wealth, the simpler human virtues would reappear, kindliness and sympathy would begin to manifest themselves as never within the memory of the living, and all those social wrongs and disparities which have root in an artificially developed selfishness would automatically tend to readjust themselves.

It is not part of my purpose to suggest precisely what program would be necessary in the accomplishment of this end; but it must be obvious that the general direction of the solution would be socialistic. It seems certain that fear and the devastating consequences of fear will never be eradicated until we have attained, as a minimum, a general and *adequate* State-controlled system of unemployment insurance; a similar and likewise adequate system of old-age pensions, and a satisfactory State provision for all the diseased and maimed, applied impartially and without any resulting stigma to the beneficiary. Such ends, to be fully attained, must necessarily involve a certain conscription of wealth, a reapportionment so that the surplus of the favored may serve the needs of the majority—for only by such a reapportionment, remote as it may seem to us in America today, can we hope to provide the masses with that security which will master the disruptive giant of fear, and with that harmony of purpose which will enable them to act as a social unit in combatting economic weaknesses and depressions and in advancing toward an ideal of social and cultural achievement. STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

The Fascist Raj

There is enough to be surprised at in our time. But so there was presumably in our grandparents' time. It is more remarkable that that which excites our wonder is as often as not the same as that which excited our grandparents.

Take for instance our indignation when others do something most objectionable, which we ourselves do in exactly the same manner. What is that but "the mote in thy brother's eye"? And the beam in your own eye, which you can never see, and which it always surprises the rest of us that you are blind to.

You may for instance find Englishmen who are shocked by the Jugo-Slav dictatorship. This dictatorship has now gone so far that it not only gags the press and all oppositional mouths of the country, censors telegrams and cuts the country off from the rest of the world, but even deports correspondents to the *Berliner Tageblatt,* the *Frankfurter Zeiting,* and the *Times.* The indignation breaks out even in the English press, which demands a public protest against this dictatorship which hopes to save itself by concealing the true state of affairs, and by stifling every cry for help.

But read India instead of Jugo-Slavia and place England in the chair of dictatorship, and where is the difference? How are the foreign correspondents treated in India? Not even by way of America do we get anything but little drops from this huge, heaving ocean, where the English have forced the current down under the surface. Reports from people who have been there and come back and describe what they have seen are almost the only information one gets. And those reports do not appear in the daily press. There one finds only the "deplorable" fights between Mohammedan and Hindus, which on the other hand are proclaimed in big capitals in the press all over the world. For they benefit England and harm India.

But the volleys of rifle shots and the police attacks on the population are not mentioned.

When it happens in Jugo-Slavia, even an Englishman is shocked. When it happens in India it is a matter of course.

Another peculiarity of the same antiquity is the admiration for something in a foreign country which one would give one's life to get rid of in one's own country. Look at Mussolini's dictatorship, for instance! It is exactly similar to that of Jugo-Slavia, also as regards suppression of the freedom of speech and of the opposition.

If you buy a newspaper in Rome at seven o'clock

in the morning and are surprised at a somewhat bold sentence, the whole edition is confiscated at seven-five, and if you buy it a couple of hours later, there is nothing more to surprise you in that paper. Nevertheless you will hear people in all countries shout for Mussolini as soon as something goes wrong. And as everything goes wrong at present, there are by now not a few people who shout.

Most of them, of course, are people who know just as little of Italy under Mussolini as they know of India under the English, honest citizens, to whom Fascism and dictatorship mean a bulwark for themselves and all honest citizens. While paying homage to Mussolini they look askance at Russia and have a vision of Mussolini, like a new St. George, killing the dragon of the Bolsheviks with his two armies. To them Fascism is a religion, arising from Bolshevik scare, and it is useless trying to teach that kind of people.

It makes a far stronger impression to read the sympathetic articles on Mussolini and Fascism which are continually found in Indian liberal papers and periodicals written both by foreigners and by Indians, especially now that a mortal battle is being fought in India to get rid of a system which in its effects is as much like Fascism as one drop of water is like the other, if only one reads Fascists instead of Englishmen.

The English rule in India is a system which, like Fascism, is supported by means of soldiers and police. Fascism in Italy is a party government where the supporters of the party get all privileges and concessions and hold the best offices by turns. They form a privileged caste just like Englishmen in India. If a Fascist, for instance, has been mayor for five years and has become a rich man, he is dismissed to make room for the next. Is it not the same in the cases of the Indian governors? If a Fascist appears in court against a man outside the party, the Fascist wins the case. Is not the Englishman equally successful when he appears in the English court of justice in India against an Indian?

"The Fascists eat, and the rest of us go hungry," say the Italians, and the country is on the verge of ruin. The population is oppressed by taxes, with wages that are steadily declining, and prices that are not following suit. This with an army budget which during the three years from 1925-28 rose by 40%, with a police force costing almost £10,000,000 or twice as much as that of France, with the lira stabilized at a rate of exchange which has no basis in reality, just like the rupee in India.

The International Labor Office quotes the wages of the Italian artisan as the lowest in Europe, and living expenses average less than one-third of those in England. Wages have gone down from 13 to 35% *under* the pre-war level. A metal worker at Turin, where wages are above the average, is paid 36 s. a week, an artisan at Milan about 25. These figures have recently been reduced by 12%, and in many cases 5% is deducted in income tax. The employer may only engage men through a labor exchange and must give preference to Fascists.

In the report of the Whitley Commission a Bombay textile worker's wages, for instance, are given as 55 s. a month for men, 27 s. for women. At Sholapur they are 35 s. 2d., for women 14 s. 4d. and for children 8 s. The report is long, but Indian intellectuals presumably know how their own people live under the English Fascism.

The effect of such a system of oppression and exploitation may be imagined by everybody. The temptation to side with the government for the sake of profit is great. The indignation against those who do so not less. The result is hatred, vindictiveness and envy in those who are wronged, and the system of espionage and bribery abolishes all feeling of security, confidence, and justice.

In India, where it has been maintained for 180 years, it has produced what Gandhi calls a slave mentality, a cringing submission, an abandonment of the people's own dignity, arising from the feeling of inferiority, which is the result of the arrogance and contempt of the English.

Beside these facts, which are based on information given by the Fascists themselves, for instance in The Fascist Industrial Union of Milan, there is one point, which is, if possible, still more conspicuous when one reads or hears about Indians, who have taken a fancy to Mussolini.

If this dictator has had any other idea than that of coming into power and has any other than that of staying there, then that idea is the colonies of Italy. Whenever Mussolini mounts the cothurnus he throws out the word, "the Italian Empire," to his Blackshirts, who answer with all arms raised and all mouths open in a war cry. Has India forgotten that she is herself a colony, or does India think that the colonies of Italy are better off under Mussolini than India under the English? Does India know how Mussolini, when the Arabs would not submit, had them shot down by hundreds every day for a long time? Like the English in India he is firmly convinced of the superiority of his own white race to all "colored people" and of his right to treat them as if they did not belong to the same humanity as he himself.

If Mahatma Gandhi's beautiful teaching of the unity of all mankind beyond frontiers, creeds and races has not penetrated farther into the minds of the intellectuals of India, at least the understanding of what an empire means must have penetrated into a colony.

E. H.*

*"E. H.," the author of this article, is well known to us. In signing these initials of her name, she writes: "As I still have my flat in Rome, where I stay some months each year, I prefer not to sign my name." Could any comment on Fascism be more eloquent?—Editor.

Trinkets

Shattered bits of colored glass
Are mummers of celestial light.
On these we dote, oblivious quite
Of the native fire of spheres that pass
In circles on eternal flight,—
Harmoniously in circles pass
To flood the windows of our sight.
But sensual we the streamers slight
For trifling bits of colored glass.

Poor art—poor snubbed sublimity,
Go hide, go hide for very shame!
A jack to Sovereign Gaudery,
Friendless Beggar is your name.

How can we see your flaming sky
With radiant rainbows ribbed around
If dumbly fascinated by
Broken bottles on the ground?

LeGarde S. Doughty.

The Study Table

Philosophy and Some Practical Problems

Here is a book* the first two hundred pages of which would undoubtedly be somewhat dry to any reader not particularly interested in metaphysics and philosophy. Yet there remain some four hundred pages of discussion dealing with topics of considerable interest to every educated man. Many of these pages contain seminal paragraphs concerning problems of practical interest, informed by a profound insight into many questions current in intellectual circles, lay and professional—although couched in a phraseology, for the most part, which would be rather obscure without reference to the introductory section (there are no chapters), in which the terms employed are fully and clearly defined.

Mr. Haserot is, primarily, a metaphysician and philosopher, committed to a mathematical interpretation of the universe—physical, organic (biological), psychical, moral, and aesthetic. Even so, he manages always to keep his feet on the ground, basing his interpretations and his always tentative conclusions on the most recent findings of empirical science.

Although it is hardly possible to give an adequate survey of this unique volume within the limitations of magazine space, some idea of the author's method of exposition and his fundamental principles may be inferred from a few typical citations.

In an early section, entitled "Being," we learn, for example, that when we consider "the difference between *a* being or *some* beings and being in itself," we recognize that "being is a universal." There follow a dozen pages of what to some readers, even of considerable culture, may suggest nothing more tangible and illuminating than so much clever verbosity. But, according to the author, the following, presumably rather important, theses have thereby been laid down and emphasized: the organic character of a relation; the nature of a particular thing as a regressus of relations; the coalescence of a relation into the syntactical whole of the realm of being; the formal character of substance; the identity of number and universal; and the mathematical character of the context of universals.

Even though all this may be quite true, it might seem rather discouraging reading to many fairly intelligent readers. It would be a mistake however, if "in the book that day they read no more." For many pertinent, practical questions are to be raised and answered in following sections. Take, by way of example, the few pages devoted to a discussion of tolerance and intolerance. To quote a few statements in point:

> Now it is very easy to say that tolerance is desirable and intolerance undesirable. It is quite another thing to give an intelligible account of this proposition and attribute some meaning to it beyond that of an uncriticized platitude. There is no *a priori* reason why some instances of intolerance might not be good and some instance of tolerance bad.
>
> [As a matter of fact] it is not tolerance in itself that is good but tolerance in certain relations or in certain situations —for if tolerance is good in itself then every instance of it is good. . . . In practically all "success" there is intolerance somewhere. . . . By tolerance . . . we mean an attitude which is at once skeptical and critical about judgments of value. . . . It does not follow from the nature either of tolerance or intolerance that the one is always constructive or the other is always destructive of value, although this *may* for the most part be true.
>
> . . . It is possible that coercion might lead to good and tolerance to bad results. . . . Tolerance is not possible where intolerance is not possible. . . . People who entertain immovable convictions about right and wrong and assume a gratuitous prerogative of foisting these onto others irrespective of the differences of these others in temperaments and opinion, entertain just a little egotism on the one hand and barbarism on the other.

The foregoing excerpts are selected from a discussion of this subject covering more than four pages of equally clarifying discussion of this aspect of "The Significance of Skepticism." The author finds that the major source "of inflexibility and tight-mindedness in judgments of value is ignorance." The more intelligent person realizes that it is not necessary in order to preserve the values of his own existence to wipe out the individual differences of others. There is a kind of culture of ignorance which tends to develop absolutism in value-judgment, and such culture "produces refurbished savages but not civilized men."

On the ground that there are some problems whose adequate treatment cannot be consummated in science itself and can "either be attained in metaphysics or nowhere," twenty-nine pages are devoted to various outstanding problems of today under the general heading of "Cosmology," in two sections, the first dealing with the implications of present-day physics and the second with the field of biology—in particular, with the problem of the nature of life.

In conformity with the postulates of Relativity, the more reserved principles of Behaviorism, and modern genetic psychology, living things are defined as belonging to "the realm of particulars," which is "the realm of histories." They are distinguished from other histories in a local world "simply by the different relations of the events that constitute them," and this means that, in their manifestations in actuality, they are distinguished by behavior. Their activities constitute an event-series "marked off from other event-series by the term inanimate." Life is simply behavior of a certain type and nothing else. Hence there is "no necessity of postulating a vital spirit or other supplementary agency which, if assumed, could only enter as an added event-series into a history ('the realm of particulars') constituting the living thing without possessing any more descriptive power than does the indication of the aforementioned functions"—viz.: irritability, growth, reproduction, nutrition, expulsion of foreign bodies, and in some cases regeneration.

The postulation of a vital spirit, or directing agent, as a part of the living individual, would be gratuitous. The doctrine of vitalism implies an *awareness* on the part of the directive factor, or vital spirit. But Mr. Haserot defines consciousness or awareness as "a relation and not a substance, hence it does not enter into the essence of any real existent. . . . It is not awareness which constitutes life since were that the case the cessation of awareness would constitute death." Awareness and life may be concomitant, even in the lowest organisms, but they are not identical. Life is a matter of degree. "There are unactualized histories which in their characters would bear, if actualized, the same or a similar relation to life which life bears to the inanimate and so on indefinitely since every possible history is comprehended in the realm of existence"—a statement which should be comprehended readily by anyone who has read Santayana's "The Realm of Matter."

*"Essays on the Logic of Being." By Francis S. Haserot. Published by The Macmillan Co. $4.00.

Readers who enjoy Santayana should be profoundly interested in "Essays on the Logic of Being."

For example, what devoté of the famous Spanish-American philosopher could feel in an alien world upon reading these statements concerning evolution?

First, evolution is non-temporal. The complex ramifications of histories [alteration in the conditions of differentiation and co-ordination which pertain to a particular history or to a group of histories, i. e., individuals] which constitute evolution are made up of constituent histories which . . . are particulars in the local causal world of real existents. . . . Every existential world is evolutionary. . . . All possible differences exist. . . . Every existential world is causally intergrated. . . . Every particular is a nexus of relations.

That these statements are not only true but are important to clear thinking on physical and biological questions is set forth in preceding pages, particularly in the essays on "Difference," "Causation," and "Relation."

All particular things, for example, are "terms of relations." Any substance, inorganic or organic, is "nothing other than an integral form of essential relations, i. e., an essence or universal"? The principle of Relation involves a special interpretation of many diverse phenomena, physical, biological, and psychological. To give one example only, namely, the phenomenon of perception, defined briefly, for present purposes, as "the awareness of a particular apart from its ontological implication"—not very illuminating apart from the context! But the applications of the author's principles are quite realistic, leading to important conclusions. If we regard, for example, sense-perception, e. g., vision, as "an immediate mutative awareness relation possessing as terms histories in an existential world," just as "being to the right of" or "being greater than" is a relation, then, for reasons set forth by the author, it follows that "there is no necessity and no grounds for the division of the organism into discrete and separate physical and physiological substances in order to account for the nature of perception," since the fundamental properties of perception "are not constituted by infra-organic but by inter-existential relations." Which is to imply that perception is not a process within an organism but "a relation between existential event-series." It follows, logically at least, that the body, including the nervous system and the brain, are not substances at all, but systems of relations merged into a continuity of events, though the body is, in actuality, exactly what it is revealed to be.

The body is kinesthetic feeling, visceral feeling, sensory feeling, etc. The qualities of actual feeling *are* the body and the body is nothing more than the qualities of the feelings which constitute it. "Any individual who attends to what he actually perceives of himself and not to what he infers or imagines will recognize that he is a succession of bodily feelings." Where these feelings are present our bodies are present; where not, not. The one is identical with the other. Striving is involved in every feeling, and striving is the essence and nature of life. Striving and actual behavior are identical. An organism is an event-series of strivings, and by "will" is meant nothing more or less than the awareness and the actualization of striving. Strivings may be guided and redirected and even pointed towards their own negation, but they cannot be effaced.

Humans do not will what strivings they shall have, but, on the contrary, they become aware, in time, of the strivings which constitute their will. "It is owing to this character of the organism that humans insert their talons into one another—that, following the basic striving of which they were the expressions, they coerce, control, subjugate, or destroy."

Perhaps the reader has gained at least some idea from the foregoing brief discussion of a few of the conceptions set forth in these fifty-nine short essays. The essays deal with nearly all the more fundamental problems of philosophy and science that perplex and allure critical minds today. They are worth the attention, be it favorable or antagonistic, of serious students of the questions involved.

MAYNARD SHIPLEY.

Gas Warfare

Picture books—photographs and drawings—are proving to be an enormously effective method of teaching truth. We have already reviewed in these columns the volumes, published in Germany and in America, of photographs showing the terrors and horrors of war. A few weeks ago we commented on the drawings of Arthur Stadler, published in Holland under the terse title, "1914—?", which showed these terrors and horhors even more effectively than the photographs of actual reality.

Now comes another collection of drawings,* devoted this time to depicting the special agonies of gas warfare. The pictures are the work of M. G. Zilzer, a Hungarian artist long resident in Paris, who has exhibited in many of the most famous European salons. They are preceded by a Foreword (in French, German, and English), by Romain Rolland.

The effectiveness of these drawings cannot be exaggerated. Not only the designing and execution, but the satirical fury with which they are conceived, make them works of overwhelming power. The arrangement of the two dozen pictures is particularly impressive. First, we see a cabinet of ministers plotting and planning war. Then come the chemists generating poison in their laboratories. This is followed by the mobilization of air-machines and gas-ammunition, the mania of the people generated by the screams of the press that *"la guerre est une necessité,"* the flight of the winged instruments of death, and the dropping down of bombs upon a defenseless city. Then come a succession of sickening pictures depicting scenes in the city as men, women and children—on the streets, in the homes, in the schools—strangle to death. A scene in a cathedral, with minister and congregation dead as politicians and war-makers drop wreaths upon the piled-up corpses, is particularly effective. The final horrors lead to the last picture—a vast multitude grinding arms and weapons into dust beneath their feet, and swearing together an eternal vow of peace.

One wonders, after viewing these awful drawings —awful because so true!—where the artist gets his hope that war will be done away with. Romain Rolland has no such hope—at least for this age. He believes that "human insanity (is) irremediable."—But he cherishes at the end the faith that mankind "will survive this pestilence as it has survived others." Only "it will be subdued and once more driven back many centuries."

J. H. H.

*"Gaz," 24 lithographies originales de G. Zilzer Published by Grand Librairie Univirselle, Paris, France—40 fr.

What's Going on in Washington

Once more the talented prestidigitators of "Washington Merry-go-Round"* display for us their glittering mechanism in whirlwind revolution: marriage marts; diplomatic wastrels; promoter presidents; cotillion secretaries of war; disheveled bonus stragglers; ermined judicial despots; treasury colossi of opulence and predacity; huge military juggernauts of iron and steel captained by mountains of gold braid; postoffice hatchet men; sardonic timeservers; truckling lame ducks; small time racketeers; Janizary lobbyists—all these and many more go spinning by in a weird wild whirligig. A peep-show on Washington; a tenpenny pocket kaleidoscope of the Hoover administration at large—this is "More Merry-go-Round."

Swift would have loved it. The American taxpayer, to whom it is affectionately dedicated, rubbing his eyes until the full import of the spectacle finally seeps into him (if indeed it does), is likely to have a different reaction. Asking himself whether putting Mr. Roosevelt on the machine instead would produce a better show, he may have his decided doubts. But his reaction, basical though it is, is not the important thing. What is important, is the fact that, in this book and its fellows, whose name is legion—confused, distorted, scattered around recklessly in Rabelaisian abundance—are the stately tooled tomes of history lining the towered library of the philosopher of the future, to be taken down by him and read with a smile of irony not untinged with admiration, whenever he is in the mood to discover just what 1928-32 in America was all about.

R. C. SCHALLER.

*"More Merry-go-Round," Anonymous. Published by Liveright, 1932. $3.00.

Correspondence

Socialism Before and After the Election

Editor of UNITY:

Two letters published in recent issues of the Boston *Transcript*, one on "Growing Socialism," the other on "Receding Socialism" invite attention to the facts. Some dozen years ago we learn, when the powerful leadership of Eugene Debs was at its height, the Socialist vote was once over 900,000. This year it was about 600,000. But it would be a great mistake to think that the vote for the Socialist Party this year was made up entirely or even predominantly of Socialists. The writer on "Growing Socialism" says that the vote for Norman Thomas in Massachusetts, five times that of four years ago," represents a straight increase of Socialist sentiment, as the protest votes all went to Mr. Roosevelt." This is merely an echo of the assertion by Norman Thomas, the Socialist leader, who in a statement published in the newspapers two days after the election said, "It is evident that what we got was the convinced Socialist." Obviously the mass protest vote being made up entirely of "convinced Socialists" was of course nonsense, and it showed rank ingratitude to claim it; but it was precisely what I predicted a month before the election. I said in a statement then published, "The 'protesters' who come under the Socialist banner for the election will have no recognition as such when the vote is counted, but all will be reckoned as swelling the Socialist movement."

Yet I believe that the difference between the Socialist vote in 1928 and in 1932 consisted almost entirely of this "protest," and is not to be regarded as in any sense a Socialist increase. As concerns Massachusetts, there can be little doubt of it. The Socialist vote in Massachusetts in 1928 was 6,262 and in the whole country 267,420—perhaps 350,000 less than in 1932. Socialism here in 1928 was at a low ebb as compared with the palmy days of Mr. Debs. To assume, as Mr. Thomas chooses to do, that the men and women who voted for him not as Socialists but by way of protest against what they considered reactionary and menacing tendencies in the two great parties, was a negligible number, is either to be blind or to be playing very bad politics. He ignores entirely the vote and influence, to mention a single item, of the League for Independent Political Action, which if not a great movement is certainly a very considerable one. Its activity in every part of the country during the last three years has been untiring; and it has become so large that when it held its national convention at Cleveland in July there were a thousand delegates present representing almost every state in the Union. They voted, as their way of "protest" against the current evils, for Norman Thomas. They frankly declared that their movement was not to be regarded as a Socialist movement. Their hope for a big "protest vote," as one of their officials declared, was that it would "encourage those who desire a third liberal party without the Socialist name." I think it was a great mistake from which the movement, undoubtedly inspired by devoted and patriotic men, will but slowly recover. But the point here is that they did it; and the adherents of this movement alone undoubtedly cast more than one-half of the 350,000 votes in excess of the 1928 Socialist number. This was but one contribution to the "protest" vote, although perhaps the largest single contribution. Nobody familiar with the widespread and zealous "protest" activities can doubt that this rolled up the other 175,000 votes. The most that common sense can concede to the "convinced Socialist" vote is 267,420, the 1928 figure.

The matter can be studied at close range in Massachusetts as well as anywhere else. The increase of the vote for the Socialist candidate in 1932 over 1928 was 16,546. The writer on "Growing Socialism" implies that this increase came chiefly from the workers in such industrial centers as Lynn, Brockton, Lawrence and Holyoke. I believe that three-quarters of it was from the "intellectuals" in their "protest" vote and represents in no important way a gain by the "convinced Socialists." It was the "protesters" who did most of the talking, wrote most of the letters to the newspapers, and did the big boasting. Their candidate would have a million votes! two millions!!—one heroic and exuberant Boston soul had it three millions!!! We may say these people were wild, that they were poor politicians, that they do not know their United States; but it is ridiculous, and for the Socialist leader most ungrateful to say that they did not exist. Every informed and observant person knows how intense and clamorous was the "protest" campaign in our college towns and intellectual centers. A Smith College professor was nominated for Congress on the Socialist ticket in the Northampton district whose paramount political concern is certainly not the putting of our business into the hands of the government. At a great mass meeting in Boston, to hear an address by the Socialist leader the week before the election, Tremont Temple was packed with 3,000 people, mostly presumably sympathizers, who doubtless voted as they applauded. Who were they? Not mainly "horny-handed sons of toil" but "intellectuals" from Beacon Hill, Cambridge, Brookline, and Newton. It was a representative occasion. The "protest" against the two great parties, which it lumped together as just alike and both bankrupt effected lodgement in a dozen social reform organizations like the Twentieth Century Club and members of Peace Societies, largely women, who seem to have taken at its face value Norman Thomas's preachment that the cause of war is "Capitalism" and its sole cure Socialism. Were this true, if the United States can contribute nothing efficient toward putting an end to the monstrous armaments and the war system until it becomes a Socialist nation, we have a long time to wait. There is not an American extant whose grandchildren will not be grizzled before Socialism makes a dent in the political system of the United States, which system it is for us to make broader and braver and better as the days go on.

Meanwhile might it not be well for all patriotic and high-minded men and women to ask themselves, in the light of the election, how they can best unite in practical and promising efforts to improve the condition of the country or the world. The Socialist leader's position, as put in his post-election statement, was—"In many respects it is a

blessing to the cause of Socialism that the Democratic party is so completely in power. It has no unifying principles, hope or program, nothing to hold it together save passion for office and a general acceptance of the *status quo* as against constructive changes." Whatever the modicum of truth in this, it could have been put more graciously, and would perhaps have been better later, when the speaker was not smarting under his small vote; here he could learn something from Mr. Hoover. How many in the Democratic millions does Mr. Thomas really think were actuated by "passion for office," or were foolish enough to think that the available offices would go very far in gratifying the overwhelming passion? A decent respect for the 21,000,000 fellow-citizens who voted the Democratic ticket would forbid most of us from painting them in this manner in their hour of victory; it is not a delicate form of felicitation. Even the 15,000,000 defeated Republicans dreamed that there were those in their number who had some "constructive" and conscientious purposes and aspirations for social progress. If it were true that all such purposes and programs are limited to a little coterie of 600,000 illuminated saints—or 270,000 as the case may be—our outlook would indeed be dismal. We have not so learned Jefferson and Lincoln.

It is well for every one of us, in minorities and majorities, to understand that the ups and downs of our candidates are not the crack of doom or the presage of the country's downfall. In common with a great multitude, surely not blind partisans but independent men, I deplored the defeat of President Hoover, because I feared it would prove a check to his broad and courageous international policy which is surely the paramount concern and which remains after the election as before the supreme issue; and upon this Governor Roosevelt had made no utterance whatever from the beginning to the end of his campaign. But is this now the best emphasis? Shall we not rather believe that Mr. Hoover's great peace policies will prove a commanding precedent and a challenge? Shall we not rejoice that in the Democratic party there are such strong international leaders as Norman Davis and John W. Davis and Newton D. Baker and Claude Swanson and Owen Young and George Foster Peabody, and that these men in the councils of the party in power will have double the influence possible to them in the Opposition? The practice of President Hoover of taking into counsel in every critical emergency and, in all cardinal concerns the leaders of both parties alike, practice becoming with him so common and pronounced as to constitute a veritable new policy in our government is now universally recognized to be so human and salutary that we may be sure that it will never be discontinued, but developed more and more. Men are already talking of a new "era of good feeling." Such if it comes must not be a good feeling mucilaginous and flabby, but, if it is to serve us well, muscular and prophetic; and it must reinforce the clear hand-writing on the wall warning every party, up or down, that the country is tired of drift-wood and dry-rot in high places and will suffer them no more.

As for Socialism, everything in its program which is really constructive and worth while can be effected vastly better outside of the program. Our "wealth in common," to use the phrase so dear to Edward Everett Hale, will grow more and more; and our work in common will grow. That has been the steady trend through the century, affecting our schools, our roads and bridges, our mail and water and lighting, and parks and city hospitals. Our cities, states, and nation will all become more truly cooperative commonwealths in a process as steady as experience and the common sense of most attest what things we can do best through public control and what through personal activity. That activity in a true democracy, and in an age where multiplying inventions and demands are ever opening new roads and realms will be so broad as to invite and satisfy every worthy talent, initiative, ambition, energy and enterprise. Justice and generosity will not lack spokesmen. Such a spokesman has been Norman Thomas, the Socialist leader in the recent campaign. A thousand of us who did not endorse his party or his program would heartily declare that concerning our industrial and social duties he has preached more true gospel and urgent gospel, with however much that seems to some poor policies, than any other leader during these excited and tumultuous weeks; and they would say this the more heartily in the hour of his wholesome defeat.

Boston, Massachusetts. EDWIN D. MEAD.

Breakers Ahead!

Editor of UNITY:

Now that the "wets" have made what appears to them another advance toward their goal, they are busy trying to agree upon some "wise" plan for the handling of a legalized liquor traffic. Well, the plan will have to be masterful if it is to enable the masses to drink their way back to prosperity while contributing some $800,000,000 yearly to help relieve our millionaires of their income tax burdens.

That is not all: we are promised the elimination of the bootlegger. As if this $800,000,000 of margin between liquor production cost and its selling price (when the tax is added) will offer no temptation to the bootlegger!

Also, the dry states are to be protected. After filling the heavens with clamor about the impossibility of enforcement when there were only the two international borders to guard, the wets blithely promise to guard 100 or more State borders.

In addition, the liquor problem is to be dealt with "in accordance with the customs and desires of the different communities." This means—if it means anything—local option for small sections. For state prohibition is almost as repugnant to the principle of local autonomy as is national prohibition. Now no one knows better than the liquor propagandist how futile local option would prove itself in the matter of protecting dry communities in these automobile days.

And, finally, the saloon is to be forever banished. We infer that the club and the home are to be substituted as drinking places, though it is not clear how this would improve matters. Indeed, if the liquor traffic is to run at high tide for the sake of profits and taxes, the saloon might well prove the lesser of evils as a drinking place.

If the present discontent among the people (due so largely to hard times) should result in the repeal of the 18th Amendment, probably the best solution would be to have liquor manufactured and sold by the government without profit or taxes. This would eliminate that part of the traffic that is developed by salesmanship and advertising devices, and would go far in eliminating the bootlegger from the community and the brewer from politics. But I believe prohibition, if we can keep it, is a still better solution. And millions of us do not like the idea of our government selling liquor, profit or no profit.

There are of course many sincere people who believe in the possibility of a better solution than prohibition. But your propagandist believes in nothing much—except liquor and the efficacy of cash. Their campaign was financed by interests that were actuated by greed. Most readers of UNITY doubtless have felt that this was true as referring to the brewers; but there were even more fertile resources.

Mr. W. H. Stayton, of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, in a confidential letter to his assistants (which is printed on page 4165 of the 1930 Senate Lobby report) quotes Irenee du Pont as declaring that one of his associates would save $10,000,000 in corporation taxes "if we could have, say, the British tax on beer." In the same memorandum Mr. Stayton says he has selected "by hand-picked methods the names of about two thousand men who pay income taxes on incomes of $100,000 or more." These men were to be made acquainted with the du Pont inductive reasoning on beer and asked to contribute to the Association's war chest.

Within a year there have been indications in many of our newspapers and elsewhere of the notable success of the Stayton fund campaign. Even so, it was chiefly the depression that set the tide against us, as it did against Hoover, in whose case six million voters forsook their standard. In our case the fighting is not over.

Denver, Colorado. F. S. KINDER.

Fit to Survive

Editor of UNITY:

I submit the following remark:

Reflections of a Youth

I believe in the theory of the Survival of the Fittest. I believe further that the human race should take upon itself the duty of making all its members *fit to survive!*

Dorchester, Massachusetts. HERBERT N. ROTEFSKY.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 194)

to these monopolists to control the government.

The United States is at the critical stage of its career. It will continue as a republic and the welfare of the people will again become paramount, or it will sink into a money despotism without regard to the people.

If the United States is to continue as a republic in fact as well as in name, the wealth power of the few must be curbed. The only sound way that I know of that this can be done without disorder, is by limiting the amount of wealth that a person or family can possess. There can be no return of genuine prosperity in this country until the wealth of the few is limited.

The prosperity of the country depends on the purchasing power of the people. If the people have no money or property, there can be no prosperity. The purchasing power of the people is at its lowest ebb at the present time and cannot be increased until the wealth of the few is limited by law.

In biblical times, before the Christian Era, the Jews redistributed private property every fifty years for a period of one thousand years. This fiftieth year was known as the "Jubilee" year when property consisting mainly of land, went back to the families of first owners. You will find a reference to this periodic redistribution in Liviticus, in the Bible. Every seven years private debts were remitted.

In the Ninth Century before Christ, wealth was literally redistributed in the City of Sparta by Lycurgus and a similar redistribution was made in the City of Athens four hundred years later. This latter redistribution was brought about by Solon, known as "The Lawgiver," and it affected the entire population of Athens, consisting of 250,000 persons. It brought prosperity back to the people.

The Licinian laws were passed in Rome about 367 B. C. for virtually the same purpose and the Gracchii in the Second Century before Christ or seventy years before Caesar, tried to retake all the common lands which had been appropriated by the rich during the preceding centuries.

A redistribution of wealth is sadly needed in the United States at the present time. The Rockefeller family alone owns about three billion dollars of wealth out of a total of about three hundred billion in the entire nation, or about one percent of all the wealth of all the people. The income of this family is estimated at more than $200,000,000 a year. One hundred other families each owns more than $100,000,000 and their incomes are in proportion to the amount of their possessions.

This is obviously an unhealthy condition and until the wealth and incomes of the few are limited and the incomes of the many increased, there can be no real prosperity in the United States. The people are now overburdened with taxes to keep an outworn and unjust economic system alive.

For eighteen years I have been advocating in writing and in speeches, an amendment to the United States Constitution limiting excessive private fortunes, so that the surplus or excess over a certain amount goes back to the Government. Such an amendment, if adopted, would write the principle of private wealth limitation into the Constitution and each generation could fix its own limit.

If this amendment is adopted, the United States Government would immediately come into the possession of at least ten billion dollars of capital wealth now owned by the few. The Government would immediately become the leading factor in and chief beneficiary of all monopolistic corporations in place of the few who now control them.

The Government does not need excess revenue from these corporations in order to pile up excessive fortunes. All it needs is normal income for government purposes. It could transfer its holdings in local utilities and in the bonds of cities of which it might become possessed, to the cities in which these utilities are located and which issued these bonds. These bonds could be cancelled and the cities would derive revenue from their local utilities without cost.

The Nation could transfer to the various states, all the bonds issued by these states of which it might become possessed, besides holdings in intrastate utilities. The bonds of these states so transferred could be cancelled and the states would obtain revenue from its holdings in the intrastate utilities.

The Federal Government would retain possession of all the bonds it issued of which it might become repossessed, which could be cancelled, and it would draw revenue from the securities in all national monopolistic corporations which it obtained by limiting the wealth of the few. In this way the Federal Government would obtain almost enough revenue with which to conduct government.

Taxation in cities, states and nation would be greatly reduced and might in time disappear. This is the remedy for present economic hardship in the United States and in every other nation.

There is only one alternative to this program that I know of and that is anarchy. The American people should learn from the experience of France in 1793 and Russia in 1917 and take warning. They can use their heads and apply a sound economic remedy such as here proposed or they can let the correction go and suffer the consequences of their neglect and folly.

—*Henry H. Klein.*

New York City.

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

Subscribe to

The New Humanist

The November-December issue:

"BOURGEOIS APOLOGIA"
Theodore B. Brameld

"FORTY YEARS OF IT"
Preston Slosson

"CALIFORNIA LANDSCAPE"
Julia N. Budlong

"HUMANISM AND THE EVANGELICAL TRADITION"
F. S. Kinney

"AN AIM FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION"
Brent Dow Allinson

"AN AMERICAN LITERARY FOUNDATION"
Carl Henry Grabo

"THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR"
Maynard Shipley

"KARL BARTH"
Werner Petersman
Harold Buschman

Other Reviews and Notes

SPECIAL

The New Humanist will be sent for one year together with a copy of Joseph Walker's "Humanism as a Way of Life" for $1.75.

Subscription yearly $1.00, single copy 20c.

THE NEW HUMANIST

105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.